DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 069 221 HE 003 543

TITLE	Campus Law Enforcement.
INSTITUTION	Washington State Legislature, Olympia. Joint Committee on Higher Education.
PUB DATE	Sep 72
NOTE	29p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Colleges; *College Students; *Crime; *Higher Education; Law Enforcement; Police; *Stealing; *Universities

ABSTRACT

In a study of the nature and extent of criminal acts committed on the campuses of the Washington State colleges and universities, it was found that major crime is not a problem. However, misdemeanors are frequent occurrences and can be dealt with effectively through channels that already exist. Improved training, conscientious coordination, and the development of an understanding by the higher education community of the role of the campus police can be effective in reduction of misdemeanors as well as felonies. Thus, it is felt that no additional statutory provisions are necessary to deal with the current crime situation. (Author/HS)

ED 069221

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Washington State Legislature

JOINT COMMITTEE ON

HIGHER EDUCATION

HE001354 3

Campus Law Enforcement

1

September, 1972

Joint Committee on Higher Education
and
Municipal Committee

JOINT TASK FORCE ON CAMPUS LAW ENFORCEMENT

Senator Gordon Sandison Task Force Co-Chairman	Joint Committee on Higher Ed.
Senator Gordon L. Walgren Task Force Co-Chairman	Municipal Committee
Senator Francis Holman Task Force Co-Vice-Chairman	Joint Committee on Higher Ed.
Representative Scott Blair Task Force Co-Vice-Chairman	Municipal Committee
Jim Bricker Executive Secretary	Joint Committee on Higher Ed.
Walt Berggren Research Analyst	Municipal Committee
Lloyd Peterson Assistant Attorney General	Washington State University
Anne Winchester Deputy Coordinator	Council on Higher Education
Bill Crumbaker Law Enforcement Consultant	State Board for Comm. Coll. Ed.
Bill McDonald Dean of Students	Western Washington State College
Michael G. Shanahan Chief of Police	University of Washington
Brian Benzel Study Research Director	Joint Committee on Higher Ed.

State of Washington

JOINT COMMITTEE ON HIGHER EDUCATION

SEN. GORDON SANDISON, *Chairman*
Port Angeles
REP. BILL KISKADDEN, *Vice-Chairman*
Mountlake Terrace
REP. PEGGY JOAN MAHR, *Secretary*
Seattle
SEN. FRANCIS E. HOLMAN, *Exec. Comm.*
Lake Forest Park
REP. DONN CHARNLEY
Seattle
REP. CARLTON A. GRADDON
Spokane
SEN. ELMER C. HUNSLEY
Thornton
REP. JOHN B. RABEL
Seattle
SEN. JOE STORTINI
Tacoma
SEN. BRUCE A. WILSON
Omak

J. ARNOLD BROCKER, *Executive Secretary*

Governor Daniel J. Evans and
Members of the Legislature:

The Joint Committee on Higher Education, in conjunction with the Municipal Committee, was requested by Senate Resolution 71-110 "...to prepare a study of the nature and extent of criminal acts committed on or about the campuses of the Washington institutions of higher education...." This study continued the legislative review of campus unrest which had been undertaken by the 1971 Legislature.

The committees have found that major crime is not the most significant problem on our campuses. The largest single category of reported violations was larceny of items valued at less than $50. Nonetheless, it appears that there are areas in which campus protection might be improved. The legislative proposals, requiring that campus police officers meet training standards and establishing a procedure for creation and review of community college police forces, were drafted with this goal in mind.

The joint report of the Joint Committee on Higher Education and the Municipal Committee is submitted for your consideration. It is our hope that the report recommendations, particularly the legislative proposals, will assist in the development and maintenance of quality campus law enforcement agencies.

Respectfully submitted,

Gordon Sandison
Senator Gordon Sandison, Chairman
Joint Committee on Higher Education

Gordon Walgren
Senator Gordon Walgren, Chairman
Municipal Committee

GS:cw

Enclosure

ROOM 218, HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON 98504 TELEPHONE 753-5390 AREA CODE 206

CAMPUS LAW ENFORCEMENT

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Joint Committee on Higher Education and the Municipal Committee, in compliance with the intent of Senate Resolution 71-110 (see Appendix A), recommend that:

a. *The statute authorizing police forces for the state colleges and universities (RCW 28B.10.550) be amended to require certification of training for officers to the standard established by the Washington Law Enforcement Officers' Training Commission (see Appendix B).*

b. *Optional statutory authority be extended to community college districts to establish police forces, subject to review and approval of the State Board for Community College Education for compatibility with a state plan (see Appendix C).*

c. *The appropriate officials of the institutions of higher education and municipalities meet regularly to discuss law enforcement/security matters of mutual concern.*

d. *The role of the student in supervised security work should be developed and encouraged by the respective institutions of higher education.*

POLICY QUESTIONS

1. What types of crimes and frequencies have been reported at the institutions of higher education?

2. How adequate is the legal authority for campus security?

3. Do the security/police departments at the institutions of higher education exhibit common strengths and weaknesses?

4. What is the relationship between campus police/security forces and municipal law enforcement agencies?

BACKGROUND

Senate Resolution 71-110 requested "...a study of the nature and extent of criminal acts committed on or about the campuses of the Washington institutions of higher education..." The request for this study grew from legislative concern with the campus unrest of the late 1960's. A study approach was adopted by the Joint Committee on Higher Education which created a Task Force composed of individuals knowledgeable in higher education and public safety.

After initial review of the issues, the Task Force developed a questionnaire which requested information on campus protection from public and private institutions of higher education. Information requested included statutory authority, data on types and frequencies of crimes, personnel practices, and administrative arrangements. Response to the questionnaire by the public institutions was approximately 85%. Because private institutions are patroled by municipal agencies, the response was limited. (See Appendix D for a copy of the questionnaire.)

FINDINGS

Data on Campus Crimes. Major crime is not a problem on the campuses of institutions of higher education. However, misdemeanors are frequent occurences and can be dealt with effectively through channels which already exist. Improved training, conscientious coordination, and the development of an understanding by the higher education community of the role of the campus police can be effective in reduction of misdemeanors, as well as felonies. Therefore, no additional statutory provisions would seem to be necessary to deal with the current crime situation.

Violations reported in the misdemeanor category comprise the most frequent type of crime at the institutions of higher education in the State of Washington. Approximately 40 percent of the reported criminal events at the state universities occurred in the "larceny under $50" category during the 1970-71 academic year. The state college data indicates that 30 percent of total reported criminal activity occurs in this category. In contrast, violent crime is virtually nonexistent on the campuses. Rape, the most violent form of crime reported in the survey of institutions, was reported only 4 times during the 1970-71 school term.

A gross indicator of trends in crime would be incidence per student. Table 1 indicates this ratio at the university and college levels. Data on type and frequency of crime at the community colleges was nearly nonexistent, since it is either reported to local police agencies or is not reported at all. As can be seen, the trend at the university level has stabilized and declined slightly.

TABLE 1

Year	Total Crime Reported	Total Enrollment	Rate per Student
Universities			
1961-62	1114	31,451	.0350
1966-67	1467	37,050	.0400
1968-69	2953	44,121	.0670
1969-70	3023	45,818	.0660
1970-71	2919	47,712	.0610
Colleges			
1961-62	N/A	9,500	N/A
1966-67	N/A	15,123	N/A
1968-69	426	19,135	.0223
1969-70	519	21,987	.0226
1970-71	1466	23,916	.0613

While it appears that the data in Table 1 reflect major increases in the trend and a high incidence of crime, several qualifying factors indicate that crime is not in fact a major problem. First, many people other than students must be included in a population count to use the rate of crime as a meaningful tool beyond general trend identification. The reporting system at all institutions, as a second factor, has become more sophisticated over time, accounting for major increases in the frequency of crimes reported. For example, Eastern Washington State College reported its crime with the city of Cheney until 1970-71, accounting for the sharp increase in trend for the colleges during that year. However, with improved reporting systems now appearing, the incidence level could become a more refined measurement of trends. Note that the trend has stabilized at the university level; improved reporting assists identification of this development. Finally, the type of crime reported must be noted. The figures reported above include motor vehicle accidents, suspicion, and vagrancy cases as well as the major criminal categories. Therefore, the majority of crimes reported are not serious in nature.

A final note on the data retrieved by the Task Force is reflected in Table 2; non-students are becoming an increasingly more apparent segment of those arrested. As can be seen by the data in Table 2, the relationship between arrested students and arrested non-students has reached equal proportions. This relationship indicates that problems with crime on campus are related to the broader community in which the institutions of higher education are located.

TABLE 2

	Colleges		Universities	
Year	Students Arrested	Non-students Arrested	Students Arrested	Non-students Arrested
1961-62	N/A	N/A	333	66
1966-67	N/A	N/A	217	38
1968-69	168	148	207	47
1969-70	192	169	175	141
1970-71	254	248	283	223

Statutory Authority. Current statutory authority for the four-year institutions of higher education allows optional implementation of police powers. All of the institutions, with the exceptions of Western Washington State College and The Evergreen State College, have exercised this statutory authority. The authority and power of the police force for the universities and colleges is defined in RCW 28B.10.550 and RCW 28B.10.555 (see Appendix E).

Community colleges have no specific statutory basis for creation of the type of police function authorized by the above referenced statutes. Community college needs differ, in that a resident population is practically a nonexistent concern for most campuses. However, the Task Force survey indicates that several community colleges, especially those in major urban areas, might need statutory authority to allow proper development of an effective security function.

Optional statutory authority for local community college districts to establish police forces should only be extended within minimum standards developed in a state plan by the State Board for Community College Education. A technical advisory committee, including law enforcement representatives, should be created to review the protection, financial, training, staff, and equipment needs of a district requesting implementation of statutory authority, and to advise the State Board. The State Board should be empowered to approve or deny a proposal by a district board of trustees on the basis of the compatibility of the proposal with the state plan.

Training Programs. An essential attribute of an effective police operation is well-trained personnel. Survey results of local and campus police jurisdictions indicate that training currently received by campus police personnel, with the exception of the University of Washington police agency, is less than sufficient. Basic level training standards for police officers are established by the Washington Law Enforcement Officers' Training Commission. However, training received by campus security personnel, other than at the University of Washington, is quite limited in comparison to this standard.

A primary reason for the limited amount of training available to campus police personnel is the lack of funds necessary for adequate training opportunities. For example, to send one man to the Training Commission's School at Olympic College could cost $2,000 (this figure includes travel, tuition, room and board, and the salary paid the officer during training). It is estimated, on the basis of the size of the various security agencies that nearly $25,000 would initially be required to approach the level of training required for campus police personnel (see Appendix F).

Those four-year institutions that opt for police powers should be required to certify training of personnel at levels equal to those training standards established by the Washington Law Enforcement Officers' Training Commissions. Thus, in addition to equipping officers to meet the needs of higher education institutions, improved coordination between the various law enforcement agencies could result from the peer associations developed during the training experience. (See Appendix B)

If the statutory option is extended to the community college system, the training standards should also be required. In addition, it seems important that implementation of the police authority ought to be reviewed by the State Board for Community College Education. (See Appendix C)

In all cases, adequate financial support would be necessary to permit the implementation of training requirements. Since the physical plant budget formula does not reward the institutions for police training efforts, the training would have to be financed by special appropriation or at the expense of some other physical plant expenditures. Specific appropriation would ensure the best results from training of the law enforcement officer.

Relationships Between Jurisdictions. The institutions of higher education are located in a variety of community settings throughout the state. In all cases the type of community and the type of institution influence the type of police force which is developed. For example, the University of Washington has developed a highly professional police force because of its urban setting and the unique problems which result. Western Washington State College has not utilized the enabling legislation dealing with campus police, because institutional and community relationships encouraged the use of the municipal police force to support campus security.

Campus security and/or police units and local city and county police departments have not historically enjoyed entirely cordial relationships. This condition is undoubtedly related to traditional "town-gown" strains which exist in communities where institutions of higher education are located. Geographic distinctions in jurisdiction also serve to restrict the degree of interaction between the police agencies. Jurisdictional stress may further develop because the Boards of Regents' or Trustees' security responsibilities are not well understood.

This responsibility is usually delegated to the respective institution's administrative officers; as a result, additional confusion about responsibility may occur. In most instances, therefore, lack of understanding is the result of inherent differences in the groups with which each jurisdiction identifies.

The University of Washington Police Department provides an excellent example of the result of conscious efforts at campus-community coordination. These efforts were initiated by the University of Washington Police in 1969 to discuss police concerns. These discussions were complemented by discussion sessions with members of the higher education community. In addition, a massive effort was implemented at that time to upgrade the police training and education level of the department. The result has been positive. Well-trained officers have worked to develop an understanding of the community they serve. In turn, evidence of cooperation within the University community can be seen, such as anti-bicycle theft efforts and student acceptance and reliance on dormitory patrols. The effectiveness of the peace-keeping officer on campus has been acknowledged by local law enforcement agencies, as well as by many students, faculty, and administrators.

Current relationships between the various jurisdictions exist primarily through formal contractual agreements. The ability to enter into such agreements to supplement services is legally permissible and may be the vehicle to achieve necessary formal coordination.

The need for coordination at all levels of law enforcement extends to the relationship between the total campus and city-county police agencies. Therefore, regular meeting of chiefs, legal advisors, prosecuting attorneys, and appropriate representatives of higher education to discuss mutual security concerns could create the atmosphere to develop increased understanding and respect among the various segments of law enforcement. Improved effectiveness in meeting the security needs of the campuses and the broader community would result.

The Student Role. Current practices in campus security range from nearly complete use of students in building security and parking control to the use entirely of highly trained, professional police officers. Nowhere in current practice is the student placed in a role which requires wide discretion or final responsibility.

Nonetheless, current mores have led to the development of conflicts in ideology and perception between some students and some police agencies. The need for increased understanding, therefore, cannot be overlooked. In instances where campus police have been able to exhibit by their actions an ability to relate to students, the police agency's effectiveness has increased. For example, police officers in dormitories at the University of Washington were originally resisted by students; the officers were removed. However continuation of crime problems led to renewed acceptance of blazer-clad police presence and have increased rapport between students and police. Improved protection and reduction in the number of thefts have been the result.

Western Washington State College and several community colleges provide examples of students used in support of the security function. In these institutions, students are utilized to control parking areas and traffic flow, to check buildings for unlocked doors, etc. Students in these roles work in conjunction with authorized personnel who coordinate and supervise the security function.

The role of the student in supervised security work should be developed further by the respective institutions of higher education. Exposure and experience while a student might well attract qualified, educated individuals into police work. Increased understanding of the police role on campus could assist in developing a well-rounded student, even if police work were not his ultimate profession. In addition, students could increase staff capability and facilitate creation of better relations between the security force and the student population.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A - Senate Resolution 71-110

APPENDIX B - Proposed legislation on training

APPENDIX C - Proposed enabling legislation for community colleges

APPENDIX D - Sample of the Task Force questionnaire

APPENDIX E - Current campus police statutes

APPENDIX F - Fiscal note

IN THE LEGISLATURE
of the
STATE OF WASHINGTON

SENATE RESOLUTION
1971 - Ex. 110

By Senators Jim Matson, Francis E. Holman, Elmer C. Huntley, Gordon Sandison and Jack Metcalf

WHEREAS, Throughout the nation there has been a sharp increase in the numbers of burglaries, robberies, muggings, rapes and assaults occurring on college and university campuses; and

WHEREAS, The various Washington institutions of higher education, although protected to some degree by a campus security force, are unprepared to handle the high incidence of crime; and

WHEREAS, Considerable confusion exists as to the legal power and duty of local municipal law enforcement officers to enter onto and patrol such campuses;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, By the Senate, that the Joint Committee on Higher Education of the Legislature, in cooperation with the Municipal Committee is hereby directed to prepare a study of the nature and extent of criminal acts committed on or about the campuses of the Washington institutions of higher education including but not limited to the following:

(1) The numbers and kinds of criminal actions occurring at the campuses.

(2) A summary of the disposition by both the administrations and the courts of the cases in which alleged participants have been apprehended.

(3) A survey of the legal authority and responsibility of local municipal law enforcement officers on campuses.

(4) The possible alternative solutions to the problems discovered through the study; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Joint Committee on Higher Education together with the Municipal Committee shall submit their report including any proposed legislation no later than thirty days prior to the first day of the 1973 Legislative Session.

I, Sidney R. Snyder, Secretary of the Senate, do hereby certify this is a true and correct copy of Senate Resolution No. 1971 - Ex. 110 adopted by the Senate May 10, 1971.

SIDNEY R. SNYDER
Secretary of the Senate

Appendix B

Proposed Legislation Amending 28B.10.550
July 28, 1972

AN ACT Relating to training for police forces of state colleges and universities and amending section 28B.10.550, chapter 223, Laws of 1969 ex. sess. and RCW 28B.10.550.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON:

Section 1. Section 28B.10.550, chapter 223, Laws of 1969 ex. sess. and RCW 28B.10.550 is amended to read as follows:

The boards of regents of the state universities, and the boards of trustees of the state colleges, acting independently and each on behalf of its own institution:

(1) May each establish a police force for its own institution, which force shall function under such conditions and regulations as the board prescribes; and

(2) Shall require that all officers of such force, having the powers enumerated in RCW 28B.10.555, meet the standard training and recruitment requirements promulgated by the Washington law enforcement officers' training commission pursuant to chapter 34.04 RCW under authority of chapter 43.100 RCW as now or hereafter amended. All officers required to comply with the provisions of this subsection shall meet the training requirements of the commission by July 1, 1975, or one year after initial employment, whichever is later.

~~(2)~~ (3) May supply appropriate badges and uniforms indicating the positions and authority of the members of such police force.

Appendix C

Proposed Legislation Concerning Community Colleges
July 28, 1972

AN ACT Relating to police forces for the community college system; providing for guidelines; and creating new sections.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON:

NEW SECTION. Section 1. The district boards of trustees of the community college system, subject to review and approval of the state board for community college education:

(1) May each establish a police force for its own district, which force shall function under such conditions and regulations as the board of trustees may prescribe; and

(2) Shall require that all officers of such force, having the powers enumerated in section 2, meet the standard training and recruitment requirements promulgated by the Washington law enforcement officers' training commission pursuant to chapter 34.04 RCW under authority of chapter 43.100 RCW as now or hereafter amended. All officers required to comply with the provisions of this subsection shall meet the training requirements of the commission by July 1, 1975, or one year after initial employment, whichever is later.

(3) May supply appropriate badges and uniforms indicating the positions and authority of such police force.

NEW SECTION. Section 2. The members of a police force established in section 1, when appointed and duly sworn:

(1) Shall be peace officers of the state and have such police powers as are vested in sheriffs and peace officers generally under the laws of this state; and

(2) May exercise such powers upon state lands devoted mainly to the educational or community service activities of the district;

and

(3) Shall have power to pursue and arrest beyond the limits of such state lands, if necessary, all or any violators of the rules or regulations herein provided for.

NEW SECTION. Section 3. The state board for community college education shall be responsible for developing a state plan pursuant to chapter 28B.19 RCW setting forth quidelines which shall assure minimum conditions of effectiveness are met prior to the implementation of authority granted by section 1.

NEW SECTION. Section 4. The quidelines shall at least include creation of an advisory committee including, but not limited to, representatives of law enforcement agencies. The advisory committee shall review proposals to establish police forces authorized by section 1, and shall provide the results of that review to the state board for community college education.

NEW SECTION. Section 5. If any provision of this act, or its application to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the act, or the application of the provision to other persons or circumstances, is not affected.

Appendix D
QUESTIONNAIRE ON CAMPUS CRIMES

I. STATUTORY AUTHORITY

1. What is the statutory authority for the formation of your security force?

2. What is the range of statutory authority used for security force action at your institution, i.e., how have the Regents utilized their statutory authority?

3. Remarks. *Please address comments to problem areas in the statutes, proposed changes in statutes and any areas currently not covered by the statutes, as they relate to your campus security function.*

INSTITUTION: _____

QUESTIONNAIRE COMPLETED BY: _____

TITLE : _____

JCHE/MC:bb

II. DATA Report by type the number of crimes that have been reported on your campus during the following academic years:

	1961-62			1966-67			1968-69			1969-70			1970-71		
	Total	Students	Non-Students	Total	Students	Non-Students	Total	Students	Non-Students	Total	Students	Non-Students	Total	Students	Non-Students
Homicide															
Rape															
Robbery															
Agg. Assault															
Burglary															
Larceny (over $50)															
Larceny (under $50)															
Auto Theft															
Other Assaults															
Arson															
Narcotics															
Forgery & Counterfeiting															
Fraud															
Buying, Receiving, Possessing Stolen Property															
Embezzlement															
Prostitution															
Gambling															
Juveniles															
Liquor Laws															
Sex Offenses															
Drunkenness															
Weapons															
Disorderly Conduct															
Vandalism															
Suspicion															
Vagrancy															
Offenses against family and children															
Malicious mischief															
DWI															
Motor Vehicle Traffic Accident															
Pedestrian															
Between Vehicles															
Non-collision															
Collision with bicycle															
Collision with fixed object															
Other															
TOTAL															

Appendix D-3

2. What was the student enrollment by head count at the beginning of each of the following academic years?
(This question will be completed by OPP&FM)

1961-62 _____

1966-67 _____

1968-69 _____

1969-70 _____

1970-71 _____

3. What is the pattern of disposition of cases involving student arrests through

a) the local judicial system?

b) your institutional conduct system?

4. Are there typical characteristics of persons implicated in crime on your campus, i.e., students, non-students, age, sex, etc.?

5. How extensive is the involvement of your security force in handling calls for services that are not reflected in the above questions, e.g., emergency calls, escorts, motor vehicle assistance, etc.?

6. What type of local law enforcement activity occurs on your campus, e.g., follow-up investigation, training programs, etc.?

7. Do formal or informal agreements with other law enforcement agencies exist? What areas do these agreements cover? Please describe.

Appendix D-5

III. ADMINISTRATION AND PERSONNEL

1. What is the chain of command for the security function within your institution?

2. What is the current size of your security force?

	Positions Funded	No. of Vacancies
Security Guards		
Police Officers		
Sergeants		
Lieutenants		
Captains		
Chief		
Staff Support		
TOTAL		

3. What is the budget for the security function?

	1961-62	1966-67	1968-69	1969-70	1970-71	1971-72
Salaries						
Wages						
Goods & Services						
Travel						
Equipment						
TOTAL						

4. Describe the retirement system in which security officers participate.

5. What is the extent of the selection and training program utilized by the security force?

6. Do job descriptions exist for security force personnel? If so, please attach.

7. Please provide salary averages and salary range by job classification.

8. What is the average educational level attained by security patrolmen?

9. What is the average length of service for the security force personnel?

10. Are students involved with the security function at your institution? If so, how?

IV. REMARKS

Comments should be directed to areas of personal observation on the security function. Any thoughts on how you would like to see the security function improved would be appreciated.

28B.10.550 Police forces for state colleges and universities. Authorized. The boards of regents of the state universities, and the boards of trustees of the state colleges, acting independently and each on behalf of its own institution:

(1) May each establish a police force for its own institution, which force shall function under such conditions and regulations as the board prescribes; and

(2) May supply appropriate badges and uniforms indicating the positions and authority of the members of such police force. [1969 1st ex.s. c 223 § 28B.10.550. Prior: 1965 ex.s. c 16 § 1; 1949 c 123 § 1; Rem. Supp. 1949 § 4543-16. Formerly RCW 28.76.310.]

28B.10.555 ————Powers. The members of a police force established under authority of RCW 28B.10.550, when appointed and duly sworn:

(1) Shall be peace officers of the state and have such police powers as are vested in sheriffs and peace officers generally under the laws of this state; and

(2) May exercise such powers upon state lands devoted mainly to the educational or research activities of the institution to which they were appointed; and

(3) Shall have power to pursue and arrest beyond the limits of such state lands, if necessary, all or any violators of the rules or regulations herein provided for. [1969 1st ex.s. c 223 § 28B.10.555. Prior: 1965 ex.s. c 16 § 2; 1949 c 123 § 2; Rem. Supp. 1949 § 4543-17. Formerly RCW 28.76.320.]

Form FN-1 (Rev. 12-71).

FISCAL NOTE

Appendix F

Joint Committee on Higher Education
Responding Agency Title — Code No.

REQUEST NUMBER

Concerning SR 71-110
SB NO. — HB NO.

Requested By

Reviewed By OPP&FM

Original XX
House Committee Amendment ☐
Senate Committee Amendment ☐
Engrossed House Bill ..... ☐
Engrossed Senate Bill..... ☐
Substitute ..... ☐

Bill Requested By: Executive ☐; Department ☐; Legislative Committee Jt. Com. on Higher Ed. (Title)

New Program or Activity XX; Change in Existing Program or Activity ☐

Title of Bill: An Act Relating to . . .

Training for police forces of state colleges and universities, amending RCW 28B.10.550.

ESTIMATED FISCAL IMPACT OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

A. **Revenue Impact by Fund and Source:**	BIENNIAL IMPACT FIRST YEAR Increase (Decrease)	BIENNIAL IMPACT SECOND YEAR Increase (Decrease)	BIENNIAL IMPACT TOTAL Increase (Decrease)	FIVE-YEAR IMPACT Increase (Decrease)
Fund Title:				
Source Title:				
State				
Federal				
Local				
TOTAL				
B. **Expenditure Impact by Source of Funds:**				
Fund Title:				
State	11,175	11,175	22,350	38,442
Federal				
Local				
TOTAL				
C. **Expenditure Impact Detail:**				
Man Years	4.17	4.17	8.33	14.33
Salaries and Wages	*	*	*	
Personal Service Contracts				
Goods and Services				
Travel	2,500	2,500	5,000	8,600
Equipment				
Employee Benefits				
Grants and Subsidies				
Debt Service				
Tuition	2,075	2,075	4,150	7,138
Room & Board	6,600	6,600	13,200	22,704
Capital Outlay:				
Land				
Buildings				
Improvements Other Than Buildings				
TOTAL	11,175*	11,175*	22,350*	38,442

D. Attach Explanation of Estimate
(Use Form FN-2)

Brian Benzel — Prepared By
Research Asst. — Title
7-25-72 — Date

*See attachment for explanation of the various expenditure alternatives.

Form FN-2 (10-70).

FISCAL NOTE

Appendix F-2

Joint Committee on Higher Education
Responding Agency Title

Code No.

REQUEST NUMBER

Concerning SR 71-110
SB NO.

HB NO.

7-25-72
Date Submitted

This Fiscal Note assumes the training of 50 police officers at institutions that have authorized a police force (UW, WSU, EWSC, CWSC). The University of Washington police officers are already trained at minimum levels; therefore the proportion of officers contributed by that institution will be low (compared to the size of the police department). Western Washington State College and The Evergreen State College have not yet implemented the intent of the police statute; therefore these institutions are not included in this analysis.

Institutional breakdown of the probable number of trainees is:

UW	14	(7 positions/year to fill vacancies)
WSU	19	(initial training estimate based on JCHE survey)
EWSC	10	" " " "
CWSC	7	" " " "
	50	

Training for law enforcement officers can be received through several types of programs. Several alternatives follow.

State-wide Basic Law Enforcement School. This is an 8-week training course (10 hours/day, 400 hours total) provided by the Washington Law Enforcement Officers' Training Commission. The school is conducted at Olympic College in Bremerton.

The fiscal impact of this alternative for meeting the training requirement is as follows:

Salaries and Wages (required to provide law enforcement services in the absence of officers receiving training)	[$165 x 8 wks x 50 men]	$66,000
Travel	[$100 est./man]	5,000
Tuition	[$83/session/man]	4,150
Room & Board	[$264/man]	13,200
	TOTAL	$88,350

Form FN-2 (10-70).

FISCAL NOTE

Appendix F-3

Joint Committee on Higher Education
Responding Agency Title — Code No.

Concerning REQUEST NUMBER SR 71-110
SB NO. — HB NO.

7-25-72
Date Submitted

Regional Training Commission School. The Washington Law Enforcement Officers' Training Commission also provides regional training opportunities. The school usually is operated to allow half-time work and half-time study. Room and board would be an unnecessary expense under this approach. However, salary and wage expense would still be high and travel expenses would increase.

This alternative would have the following fiscal impact:

Salaries and Wages (for trainee replacement)	$66,000
Travel ($200 est./man)	10,000
Tuition	4,150
Room & Board	---
TOTAL	$80,150

Since regional schools are offered for 4 hours per day over a longer time span, the various agencies may be able to continue operation without the need for replacement personnel. Therefore, the fiscal impact of this option may be reduced by the removal of the salary expense:

$80,150
-66,000
$14,150

Summer Session. A final alternative could be a state-wide training program held in summer months for police officers of the colleges and universities. Training currently is not provided during summer months, because of usually increased demands for police services. However, the summer months provide slack time periods for college and university police forces primarily because student populations drop drastically. Therefore the campus police force could be reduced in size for training purposes without the addition of replacement officers. Under this approach, the following fiscal

Form FN-2 (10-70).

FISCAL NOTE

Appendix F-4

Joint Committee on Higher Education
Responding Agency Title — Code No.

REQUEST NUMBER
Concerning SR 71-110
SB NO. — IB NO.

7-25-72
Date Submitted

impact might be expected:

Salaries & Wages	$ -----
Travel ($100/man)	5,000
Tuition	4,150
Room & Board	13,200
TOTAL	$22,350

Five Year Impact. After the initial training is provided, the fiscal impact of training provisions would be reduced. Only new, previously untrained, officers would be required to receive training. This situation would involve an estimated 10 percent of the total college and university police personnel per year, or 12 persons annually. The fiscal impact of the additional years is included in the summary which follows.

FISCAL SUMMARY OF TRAINING SCHOOL ALTERNATIVES

	State-wide Basic School	Regional School	Campus Police School
Salaries & Wages	$66,000	$66,000	$ ---
Travel	5,000	10,000	5,000
Tuition	4,150	4,150	4,150
Room & Board	13,200	---	13,200
BIENNIUM TOTAL	$88,350	$80,150 *	$22,350
Continuing Impact (3 years)	63,612	57,708	16,092
FIVE YR. TOTAL	$151,962	$137,858*	$38,442
Cost per person	$1,767	$1,603	$447

*
If regional schools allow an institution to maintain operations while training is received (due to altered training approach) this alternative's fiscal impact would be reduced as follows:

	$80,150	
	(66,000)	
BIENNIUM TOTAL	$14,150	$ 283 per man $24,904 five year total